

Vision Statement



Keweenaw National Historical Park

Keweenaw National Historical Park is both a physical place and a concept that challenges our traditional notions of national parks. Some 30 years after the end of significant copper mining activity, a mission is being undertaken to represent the memories of the working days on the Keweenaw Peninsula through the preservation and interpretation of cultural landscapes, sites, structures, and artifacts.

The neighborhoods, towns, and rural areas of the Keweenaw Peninsula occupy a unique region that began providing copper for human use at least 5,000 years ago. These sites contain the physical evidence of our history: mine shafts and hoist houses, the remains of numerous other industrial structures; functioning schools, theaters, churches, and commercial buildings; and a wide range of housing types from mansions to company houses and log farm buildings. In and around these sites, Keweenaw National Historical Park will weave many

themes — industry, labor, immigration, social change, architecture, archeology, geology, and the natural environment — into the complex tapestry of the Keweenaw story.

Keweenaw National Historical Park is modeled after many successful efforts to preserve not only individually significant buildings, but also entire neighborhoods, towns, and regions that provide living contexts for these buildings. The park will promote a framework for cooperation among the National Park Service, state and local governments, citizens' groups, businesses, and individuals. This innovative organizational structure will be responsive to the needs and diversity of park partners and the community.

By preserving and interpreting the past, Keweenaw National Historical Park will enrich the community and visitors of today and endow future generations with a timeless treasure.

SUMMARY

When Congress established Keweenaw National Historical Park in October 1992, it created the first national park system unit to commemorate the rich and complex story of copper mining on the Keweenaw Peninsula. The park is in the center of the Keweenaw, a small peninsula that extends about 100 miles into Lake Superior from Michigan's Upper Peninsula. The two park units, Quincy and Calumet, encompass historic industrial, commercial, and residential landscapes and structures situated along the extensive Copper Range, the belt of copper-bearing rock that forms the spine of the peninsula.

Congress has directed the secretary of the interior to prepare a general management plan in consultation with the Keweenaw National Historical Park Advisory Commission. The purpose of a general management plan is to help guide park managers during the next 10 to 15 years in opening the park to the public, managing the park's resources, and telling the copper mining story. This management plan for Keweenaw National Historical Park presents four alternative approaches to managing the park. The process of developing these alternatives included the regular involvement of the commission through their quarterly meetings as well as several public meetings and workshops with the Keweenaw community. The alternatives presented here are purposely broad to allow flexibility because full implementation will take many years and resource conditions and opportunities may change over time.

Certain actions would be needed no matter what alternative is selected. A first step is the establishment of a strong, structured partnership between the park and the private and public sectors of the community (see "A Partnership for the Park and Peninsula — The Foundation" chapter). The National Park Service would continue to assist the community in establishing local historic districts and preservation ordinances. Further, the National Park Service would pursue congressional action to activate the commission's operating authorities and to enable

the National Park Service to acquire land previously contaminated by hazardous substances that no longer pose health or safety threats. The National Park Service would also establish a limited number of cooperating sites, use various methods to protect properties in the park, and work cooperatively to ensure the long-term protection of the Osceola #13 complex.

The potential impacts of establishing preservation ordinances in both park units would be significant. The ordinances, if properly enforced, would provide the community with important tools for regulating changes made to historic properties and ensuring that new development was compatible. Without ordinances, incompatible development could diminish the distinctive qualities that make these sites worthy of being part of the national park system.

Formalizing and structuring a partnership among the National Park Service, the advisory commission, cooperating sites, and other entities could result in better coordination and prioritization of historic preservation and interpretation activities throughout the region, helping provide more diverse and higher quality visitor opportunities.

An important positive impact, particularly if the historic integrity of these sites remains high, is that the park would increasingly become a social and economic asset on a local and state level. The potential negative impact could be inappropriate development driven by personal or market forces that could result in loss of historic resources, including cultural landscape values.

Amending the park's legislation to remove the prohibition against acquiring contaminated properties would allow for more NPS flexibility in resource protection, especially when other avenues of protection fail. The potential negative aspect of NPS acquisition or management of potentially contaminated properties would be the

SUMMARY

cost of preparing pre-acquisition site assessments and the exposure to liability.

ALTERNATIVE 1

The no-action/continuation of existing management circumstances, alternative 1, proposes no changes in the current management direction. Visitors would still rely primarily on the services provided by groups like the Quincy Mine Hoist Association and Coppertown USA and other sites to learn about the historic resources and the history of copper mining on the Keweenaw. Calumet would remain primarily a self-discovery area, although some information would be available at park headquarters and other places. The park staff would continue to work in partnership with the community to find ways to protect resources and provide visitor services. These efforts would continue to be limited by minimal NPS staffing and funding.

No property would be acquired by the National Park Service. Staffing levels would probably continue with two full-time employees and perhaps one or more part-time or seasonal employees, depending on available funds.

The most significant environmental impacts of implementing alternative 1 would be the potential deterioration and possible loss of significant structures and landscapes because of the park's limited capability to fulfill its legislated mission to provide for resource protection and visitor use. Without NPS interpretive media and staff, visitors would not be provided with full opportunities to understand and appreciate the story of Keweenaw copper mining.

ALTERNATIVE 2

The community assistance alternative, alternative 2, would place the community at the forefront of implementing preservation actions and interpretive and educational programs at sites throughout the park. The protection of the park's significant resources would be vested in the local governments through the designation of local

historic districts and preservation ordinances. The National Park Service would remain primarily in the background in a support role, providing a comprehensive program of technical and financial assistance to the community to help make their actions a success. At full implementation, the primary areas of interaction between NPS staff and visitors would be at a destination visitor facility in the Quincy unit; basic visitor services would be provided in a facility at Calumet, and eventually some park interpreters would provide tours.

Some park administrative offices would be in the Quincy unit, and park's main headquarters would be in the Calumet unit. Over time, with the phased implementation of this alternative, NPS staff levels would increase.

Under this alternative, more of the important qualities of historic buildings, sites, and historic landscapes would be protected than under alternative 1; however, there would still be potential for losses of historic properties or damage to their important qualities, albeit less than under alternative 1.

Over time, the NPS mandate to establish strong partnerships with and provide substantial assistance to the community would be met. This would have a positive impact on community relations, ensure the protection and interpretation of some historic resources, and improve the visitor experience.

More visitors would be likely to come and stay longer, contributing more tourist dollars to the local economy. Increased visitation could also mean more impacts on resources, an increase in traffic and congestion, and spin off commercial development that could impact resources and aesthetics. The very limited role of the National Park Service in acquisition, direct preservation, and interpretation would probably result in a much more limited and less integrated experience for visitors than a more traditional NPS unit. Also, depending on the timing of NPS funding and what the community was capable of accomplishing, some historic resources could be lost through neglect over time.

ALTERNATIVE 3

Alternative 3, the traditional park in the core industrial areas alternative, proposes what the name states — a much more traditional park experience in the core industrial areas of each park unit. As funding and staffing levels allowed, the National Park Service would invest substantially in each of the core industrial areas by acquiring significant properties, conducting resource preservation, and adaptively using the structures. The National Park Service would install interpretive media and provide interpretive staff at key sites, establish partnerships, and provide technical and financial assistance to further core industrial area preservation. It would be primarily the community's efforts outside the park's core industrial areas that would determine the level of preservation and type of visitor experience offered there, although the park's interpretive services would probably overlap into these areas.

For visitors, the concentrated preservation and interpretation efforts in the core areas would help create a sense of entering a special place. This would contribute to visitor understanding and appreciation of the cultural significance of the sites. Higher visitation levels and longer visitor stays would be likely and would lead to increased visitor expenditures in the area, increased wear on resources, increased traffic and congestion, and spin-off commercial development. Depending on the timing of NPS funding and what the community was capable of accomplishing outside the core areas, some historic resources could be lost through neglect.

ALTERNATIVE 4

Alternative 4, the NPS preferred alternative, is actually a combination of alternative 2, the community assistance focus and a refinement of alternative 3, the traditional park focus. Over time the National Park Service would establish a strong presence through ownership and interpretation of key resources in the park units. This would be complemented by a strong partnership with and assistance program for the community

that would provide a higher quality visitor experience throughout the park than alternatives 1, 2, or 3.

The positive impacts of alternatives 2 and 3 would be combined under this alternative, resulting potentially in the broadest level of resource protection, interpretation, visitor services, and the optimum opportunity for high-quality visitor experiences. This would complement the local government and private initiatives outside the park and further improve the tourism potential of the area. Visitors would have more dispersed, parkwide opportunities that offer less crowded, more enjoyable experiences. Employment resulting from park operations, construction and restoration activities, and spin-off tourism would positively benefit the local economy as would federal expenditures through grants and land acquisition.

Although these would be the optimum positive impacts, this alternative would be phased in gradually and could take many years to fully implement. During that time there is a high potential that some significant resources could be lost due to neglect. The increase in visitation would cause wear on historic resources, contribute more traffic and congestion, and diminish the quiet small-town atmosphere of the sites, particularly in Calumet.

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PLAN

Two public meetings were held and seven letters commenting on the draft plan were received. A summary of the comments from the meetings and the letters received (with NPS responses) have been included in this document in the "Consultation and Coordination" chapter. This document has been revised to reflect public comments and correct mistakes found in the draft plan.

THE PLAN

This document is the *General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* for

SUMMARY

Keweenaw National Historical Park. After a 30-day review period, comments will be analyzed, an alternative will be selected, and a record of decision will be issued.

Comments on or questions about this plan should be submitted to

Superintendent
Keweenaw National Historical Park
P.O. Box 471
Calumet, Michigan 49913
(906) 337-3168
(906) 337-3169 (fax)

Internet address: kewesuperintendent@nps.gov

Please see the "Consultation and Coordination" chapter for locations (area libraries and offices) where the plan will be available for review.